AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace figure labeled "figure Unique" with the attached replacement figure

labeled "**Figure 1**"

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

This amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated May 2, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of the rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-29 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 30 has been canceled. Claims 31-34 are newly added. No new matter is added.

Drawings

The drawings are objected as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84.(p) (5). The objection is now moot in view of the drawing corrections.

Abstract

The abstract is objected to for contain numerical reference and for legal phraseology, e.g. means. The objection is now moot in view of new abstract.

Objections

Claims 1-2, 5-12, 19-26 and 30 are objected to because they contain numerical references to the figures. This objection is now moot in view of the amendments to the claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is now moot in view of the amendments to these claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to improve clarity.

Regarding claim 10 and 24, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 24 because the examiner asserts that "interpreting the alarm state as "unknown" renders the claim scope unclear. The alarm state being in an unknown state could mean that it is undefined and therefore 'extracting from said equipment chosen information representing said alarm state' would seem to be unachievable as there is no 'information representing said alarm state.'" Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The claims are now amended to recite :

> wherein, when the alarm state of an item of an equipment in the network is unknown, there is extracted from said equipment chosen information **able to allow determination of** said alarm state, and then the sending of primary data representing said state information is simulated so as to generate an alarm intended to indicate to the management device the alarm state of said equipment.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal of the same.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9, 13-23, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Spencer U.S. Patent No. 6,253,243 (hereinafter Spencer). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The claimed invention related to a system and method for exchanging data between equipments in a communications network and managing events occurring within the equipments.

Claim 1 recites:

> A data processing device comprising processing means for receiving, from equipment in a communications network, primary data defining events in at least one primary format and delivering to a management device in said network

14

secondary data defining alarms representing said events, in a secondary format, wherein said processing means comprise an **interpreter provided with a plurality of conversion rules, arranged in the form of scripts associated with a plurality of different primary event formats**, and arranged so as to convert, by means of said rules, primary data received in one of said primary formats into secondary data in said secondary format which can be interpreted by said management device.

In contrast, Spencer relates to a network management tools for managing distributed networks, in particular SNMP trap management. Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of Spencer cited by the Examiner in support of the rejection would not have anticipated the claimed invention.

The systems described by Spencer have certain drawbacks that the claimed invention remedies. First, the system as described specifically in figure 2 requires different protocol adapters for each type of agents and different management applications. See col. 5, lines 4-50. The system depicted in figure 4 also calls for different adapters (items 404 and 418). Second, the system relies on configuration files (item 422), wherein "SNMP trap daemon 420 reads configuration files on startup." Because this system relies on configuration files it is not suitable for situations in which the primary formats are fairly different, which is usually the case in present day communications networks.

Spencer further teaches with respect to figure 7 a filtering system to map a received trap to a particular host. See col. 16, lines 17-22. "These hosts will either be SNMP managers 714...or other SNMP trap processes in which case the trap information

15

is forwarded over an interprocess pipe. Each trap process has a platform connection to a management information server (MIS)." See col. 16, lines 55-62. Translation between SNMP traps and CMIP events notifications is controlled by the trap-maps file which resides in the configuration file. See col. 3, lines 10-20 and passim.

Applicant carefully reviewed the reference, in particular, the portions cited by the Examiner. However, nowhere in the reference does Spencer teach the invention as claimed and described in the independent claims 1, 14, 15 and 28. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that this system would not have anticipated the claimed invention because it fails to explicitly or inherently teach or suggest, at least "processing means comprise an **interpreter provided with a <u>plurality of conversion rules</u>, arranged in the form of scripts <u>associated with a plurality of different primary event formats</u>, and arranged so as to convert, by means of said rules, primary data received in one of said primary formats into secondary data in said secondary format which can be interpreted by said management device.**" Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is a method claim reciting similar limitations as highlighted above. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is patentable over Spencer under the same rationale.

Claims 14, 28 also recites similar limitations as highlighted above. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is patentable over Spencer under the same rationale.

Claims 2-9, 13, 15-23, and 27-29 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 14 or 28.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-12 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Spencer as applied to claims 7 and 21 above, and in further view of Stilwell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,696; hereinafter "Stilwell").

Stilwell fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 15 that are missing from Spencer. Thus, claims 10-12 and 24-26 are also patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 or 15.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 31, 2007

Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

17